

## Program Productivity Review II

Action: The staff recommends that the council accept the second program productivity review report, commend the universities for their continued perseverance in reviewing their academic programs, and authorize the council staff to work with the institutions as they pursue additional changes to some programs and report back to the council in early 2003.

In 2000, the council undertook its first program productivity review, which resulted in decisions by the universities to eliminate, consolidate, or alter over 300 programs. A similar review of KCTCS programs took place last year. This agenda item presents the results of the second round of productivity reviews at the universities conducted in spring 2002.

### **Academic Program Productivity Review**

When the council devolved to the institutions the authority for approving most new academic programs two years ago, it set out two expectations for the institutions and their governing boards: that the processes used to develop new programs follow council criteria (see Campus Consultation Final Report agenda item), and that the institutions be held accountable for the productivity of their existing degree programs. At the heart of both of these expectations was the desire to more closely link new and current programs to community and state needs, especially in workforce shortage areas.

In 2000, the only criteria for identifying programs for review was whether they met council-approved thresholds for degree productivity: a five-year average of 12 associate, 12 baccalaureate, seven master's, and five doctoral degrees per program.

In addition to degree productivity, the second review in 2002 gave attention to other criteria. First, programs were reviewed based on their importance in meeting important workforce needs. These included programs falling under categories identified as important to economic development by the Office of the New Economy and those addressing shortages in health professions and education. The Cabinet for Workforce Development is in the process of assessing current and future workforce needs. Nancy Laprade from the cabinet will join council staff at the meeting to discuss the relationship of that work to the council's process for development and review of academic programs.

Second, the number of students taught in the program was considered. Some productive programs produce few degrees but teach large numbers of students in service to other academic programs.

Third, the status of the program in the first productivity review was considered.

The council's review of academic programs is designed to complement—not replace—review processes already in place at the universities.

## **2002 Results**

There were 1,144 academic programs at the universities at the beginning of this review. Of those, 240 programs (21 percent) were identified for review. In December 2001, each university received a list of the academic programs identified by the council's review. The institutions were asked to review the program and inform the council whether the program should be maintained in its current form, altered, or closed. Council staff then met with university representatives to discuss the responses.

Of the 240 identified programs, the universities will close 26 (11 percent) of these programs. The universities will make changes to 67 others (28 percent) to increase productivity. Eighty-three programs will be maintained in their current form.

There are 64 programs designated for continued review. These programs were identified for continued discussion because the institution's plan for changing the program was inadequate or the rationale for keeping the program in its current form was not satisfactory. The council staff will work with the universities to address concerns. The status of programs undergoing continued review will be reported to the council March 2003.

A chart summarizing the results of the second productivity review is attached.

In the first and second round of reviews, a total of 169 academic programs have been designated for closure, and 228 are being significantly altered to increase productivity. This represented approximately 15 percent and 20 percent of the total degree programs across the campuses, respectively. Since the council devolved program approval authority to the campuses, the universities have implemented 52 new programs.

The full academic program review process for the universities and the KCTCS is described in four earlier agenda items (November 8, 1999; July 17, 2000; February 5, 2001; and July 30, 2001).

## **Follow-up to the 2000 Review**

In 2000, three program areas with low degree productivity were identified for continuing efforts to increase degree production: teacher education, foreign languages, and fine arts.

In teacher education, the public and independent institutions' chief academic officers with the Kentucky Department of Education, the Education Professional Standards Board, and the council sponsored two statewide teacher education summits, submitting reports to the P-16 Council in December 2001 and to the CPE in May 2002. Teams of faculty for each of the institutions are implementing changes in education programs to better recruit, train, and place teachers in high need areas.

In the current review, the universities have proposed changes to one-half of the low productivity foreign language and one-fourth of the low productivity fine arts departments. Four foreign language and six fine arts programs are identified for continued review. The council staff will meet with institutional chief academic officers and deans to explore ways of increasing the productivity of these programs.

Staff preparation by Barbara Cook

**Program Productivity Review II**  
**Summary of University Responses and Staff Analysis**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Low Productivity Programs</b>	<b>To be Closed</b>	<b>To be Changed</b>	<b>To be Retained Unchanged</b>	<b>Continued Review</b>
Eastern Kentucky University	46	7	16	10	13
Kentucky State University	9	1	2	0	6
Morehead State University	17	1	5	8	3
Murray State University	40	4	18	7	11
Northern Kentucky University	13	0	1	9	3
University of Kentucky	80	3	15	39	23
University of Louisville	2	0	0	2	0
Western Kentucky University	33	10	10	8	5
Totals:	240	26	67	83	64